Local Law Enforcement Technology in Massachusetts

A Report of the 1998 Police Automation Survey

Commonwealth of Massachusetts
Executive Office of Public Safety
Programs Division

Paul Cellucci
Governor

Jane Swift
Lieutenant Governor

Jane Perlov
Secretary of Public Safety

Michael O'Toole
Executive Director

This document was prepared by the Massachusetts Statistical Analysis Center.

Authors:

Diana Brensilber, Statistical Analysis Center Director
Kathleen Krasco, Statistical Analysis Center Deputy Director
Sara Phillips, Research Analyst
Patricia Bergin, Research Analyst

If you refer to this report in a publication or in any other manner, we would appreciate being informed about such a reference. Whenever possible, a copy of such a document or reference should be sent to the Statistical Analysis Center at the address below.

If you have any questions or feedback regarding this report or the survey, please contact:

Massachusetts Statistical Analysis Center
Executive Office of Public Safety
Programs Division
1 Ashburton Place, Room 2110
Boston, MA 02108
Telephone: (617) 727-6300
E-Mail: Kathy.Krasco@state.ma.us
Internet address: http://www.state.ma.us/ccj

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors would like to thank Charles Kaufmann (former Deputy Director of the SAC) for designing both the paper and computer versions of the 1998 Automation Survey. Mr. Kaufmann also provided invaluable technical assistance in the writing of this report. The authors would also like to thank Jim Slater and James Putlack of the Criminal History Systems Board for their invaluable technical assistance. Michael O'Toole, Craig Burlingame, and Phil Welton also provided very helpful comments and suggestions, and we thank them for their time and support of this project.

Most importantly, we would like to express our gratitude to the Massachusetts police departments that responded to the survey. We hope you find the survey findings informative and of use to your department.

CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Overview

The Massachusetts Police Automation Survey is designed to obtain information relevant to the use of computers, equipment, and technology applications by law enforcement agencies in the Commonwealth. This year marks the third consecutive year the Police Automation Survey has been administered.

The 1998 survey was mailed to all 351 local police departments in a paper version in December of 1998. The survey was also made available electronically through Criminal Justice Information System (CJIS) Data Transfer Terminals and on-line at the Executive Office of Public Safety Programs Division website. Approximately 91% of local departments (319 agencies) completed the survey, representing 94% (5,683,475) of the Massachusetts population. Some of the more noteworthy technological achievements by Massachusetts police agencies are highlighted below.

Selected Findings

- Twenty-seven percent of responding police agencies (88 departments) reported that their department has a World Wide Web site. This represents a 4.6% increase from the percentage of departments reporting a Web site in 1997.

- The existence of laptop computers in police departments increased from 127 departments (41.1%) in 1997 to 170 departments (53.2%) in 1998. These 170 departments reported a minimum of one laptop and a maximum of 105 laptops in a department. The total number of laptop computers possessed by Massachusetts police departments is 1,229.

- Ninety-five departments responded they had a Mobile Data Terminal (29.7%), with a minimum of 1 MDT and a maximum of 320 MDTs in a department, for a total of 886 MDTs in the Commonwealth.

- One hundred and ninety four (194) police departments reported they have implemented an Offense Based Tracking Number (OBTN) system, an from the 181 departments who reported OBTN use in 1997.

Summary

Massachusetts police departments continue to make strides in incorporating technology into their day-to-day operations, while expanding their communication capabilities. Competent technology and communication equipment improves overall police efficiency. Equipped with the proper tools and knowledge, police can respond to crimes more effectively, while organizing their resources and manpower more efficiently. Such technological advances allow officers to spend more time on the street, interacting and responding to the needs of citizens. As a result, police departments across the Commonwealth are better serving citizens because of the improvements made in their technology and communication capabilities. The information contained in this report reflects both the progress achieved by local police departments, as well as the areas that are in need of improvement.

COMPUTER EQUIPMENT

Mainframes/Mini-Computers

Mainframes and mini-computers serve the purpose of supporting a number of remote terminals (Webster's, 1998). The 1998 Police Automation Survey asked local police departments if they were currently using a mainframe/mini-computer and, if so, what type was in place. As displayed in Table 1, 67 police departments (21%) reportedly did not have a mainframe/mini-computer in place. The most frequently reported mainframe/mini-computer was DEC, used by 19.4% of responding departments.

Table 1. MAINFRAMES/ MINI-COMPUTERS

Mainframe/ Mini-Computer	# of Departments	Percent of Total
DEC	62	19.4%
IBM	41	12.9%
Hewlett Packard	35	11.0%
Unisys	18	5.6%
Wang	4	1.3%
Data General	2	.6%
McDonnell-Douglas	2	.6%
Other	53	16.6%
No Mainframe	67	21.0%

Personal Computers

Personal computers are desktop computing devices (AFC Computer Services, 1999). Police departments were asked to indicate the type(s) and number of personal computer systems they were using. The table below indicates the number of departments who have a particular system, the minimum and maximum number of computers used by a department, and the total number of each computer system in use in departments across the Commonwealth.

Table 2. PERSONAL COMPUTERS

Personal Computers	# of Departments	Percent of Total	Minimum	Maximum	Total
Pentium II & III	250	78.3%	1	840	3,049
MS-DOS 486	137	42.9%	1	50	679
MS-DOS 386	48	15.0%	1	20	143
MS-DOS 286	13	4.0%	1	12	37
MS-DOS 8088	1	.3%	2	2	2
Other	20	6.2%	1	60	146
TOTAL					4,055

The survey reported a marked increase in the number of Pentium computers in use from 1997 to 1998 (1,716 in 1997 to 3,049 in 1998). As Table 2 demonstrates, although the majority of

responding police departments (78%) possess a Pentium computer, this survey found that a number of less powerful machines (e.g., MS-DOS 8088, 286, and 386) are still in use in police departments in the Commonwealth. In addition, 6 departments reportedly use an Apple/Macintosh computer.

Laptop Computers

A laptop computer is a portable computer smaller in size than a desktop computer (Webster's, 1998). The existence of laptop computers in police departments increased from 127 departments (41.1%) in 1997 to 170 departments (53.2%) in 1998. These 170 departments reported a minimum of one laptop and a maximum of 105 laptops in a department. The total number of laptop computers possessed by Massachusetts police departments is 1,229. When asked what purpose laptop computers serve, 109 (34.2%) departments responded they use the laptop for report writing, 64 (20.1%) use it for data transfer, 83 (26%) for CJIS, and 59 (18.5%) use laptops for other tasks.

Of the 89 departments who have laptops connected to a network, 29 (32.6%) are directly connected, 40 (44.9%) are connected through a Cerulean (Packet Cluster) mobile data system, 23 (25.8%) through a modem, 21 (23.6%) through cellular technology, and 7 (7.9%) departments have their laptops connected to their network through another type of connection.

Network Connections

A network is simply a connection of multiple computers. Networks allow computer users to communicate easily, share computer resources, and control access to data (AFC Computer Services, 1999). A Wide-Area Network (WAN) is a network that consists of multiple systems that may cover a large physical area. A Local Area Network (LAN) is a group of computers in close proximity (same office or building) that share programs, data, etc. (Sun Microsystems, 1999).

The 1998 Police Automation Survey asked police departments to report the type of network to which their department's personal computers were connected, other than CJIS. Twenty-six (26) departments (8.2%) reported they have computers connected to a WAN and 117 departments (36.7%) reported they have a LAN connection (Table 3). Twenty-eight departments (8.8%) reported they have both LAN and WAN connections. One hundred and forty-eight (148) departments (46.4%) reported they do not have any computers connected to a network.

Table 3. NETWORK CONNECTIONS

Network Connections	Frequency	Percent of Total
WAN Connection Only	26	8.2%
LAN Connection Only	117	36.7%
WAN and LAN Connections	28	8.8%
Neither WAN nor LAN Connections	148	46.4%

Police departments connected to a Wide Area Network reported other entities connected to their Network. Twelve percent of all police respondents reported sharing a WAN with other

municipal offices, whereas 11% of departments reported having a WAN connected to the Internet (Table 4).

Table 4. WIDE AREA NETWORK (WAN) CONNECTIONS

WAN Connections	Frequency	Percent of Total
Municipal Offices	38	11.9%
Internet	34	10.7%
Town-Wide Network	29	9.1%
Fire Department	27	8.5%
School Department	13	4.1%
Other	3	.9%

Police departments that indicated they were connected to a WAN or LAN were also asked to specify the type of operating system being used. As Table 5 indicates, the majority of departments that reported having a network connection, utilized Windows NT as their operating system.

Table 5. NETWORK OPERATING SYSTEMS

Network Operating System	Frequency	Percent of Total
Windows NT	26	8.1%
Novell	11	3.4%
Unix	8	2.5%
VAX/VMS	7	2.1%
Other	6	1.8%
Banyan Vines	1	.3%

CJIS Connected Equipment

The Criminal Justice Information System (CJIS) is an information network, which connects local Massachusetts law enforcement agencies to the Criminal History Systems Board (CHSB) and, through CHSB, the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Law enforcement primarily uses CJIS to conduct criminal background checks. Through CJIS, CHSB dispatches current warrant information to local police departments. Improvements, such as electronic transmission of fingerprints, are planned.

Table 6 indicates the number of departments who have equipment connected to the CJIS system, the minimum and maximum number of CJIS devices departments have, and the sum of each type of CJIS equipment. It is important to report that this information is slightly lower than records maintained by the Executive Office of Public Safety Programs Division. In 1996 and 1997, the Programs Division awarded 268 local police departments with CJIS-connected personal computers and printers through the Edward Byrne Memorial Local Law Enforcement Assistance Grant Program.

Table 6. CJIS CONNECTED EQUIPMENT

CJIS Connected Equipment	# of Departments	Minimum	Maximum	Total
Printers	254	1	51	436
Terminals	230	1	51	352
PC/Workstation	100	1	17	187
Mobil Data Terminals (MDTs)	84	1	300	795
Laptop Computers	62	1	35	566
Other	10	1	18	37

Modems

A modem is a device that enables a machine or terminal to establish a connection and transfer data through telephone lines to another computer (Sun Microsystems, 1999). The speed of data transmission by modems are measured by bps (bits per second) and kbps (kilobits per second).

Local police departments were asked to specify the number of modems they use and the maximum speed supported by the modems. The three most popular modems are 56 kbps, 33.6 kbps, and 28.8 kbps. Although more than half of responding police departments (51%) possess 56 kbps modem, this survey found that a number of slower modems (e.g., 1200, 2400, and 4800 bps) are still used by Massachusetts police departments. Despite this fact, this survey found a significant increase in the number of agencies with 56 kbps modems as compared to the 1997 survey (32 departments in 1997 vs. 163 departments in 1998).

Table 7 indicates the number of departments who have a particular modem, the minimum and maximum number of modems possessed by a department, and the total number of modems in use by police departments in Massachusetts.

Table 7. MODEMS

Modem	# of Departments	Minimum	Maximum	Total
56 kbps	163	1	30	440
28.8 kbps	84	1	45	221
33.6 kbps	82	1	20	198
9600 bps	44	1	12	86
14.4 kbps	38	1	15	91
2400 bps	13	1	4	18
4800 bps	8	1	5	13
1200 bps	3	1	1	3
Other	8	1	7	23

Police departments were also asked whether they currently transmit and/or receive data electronically via modem. As demonstrated in Table 8, of the 306 departments responding to this question, 173 transmit data via modem, 113 do not transmit data via modem while 9 responded there was no need to transmit data via a modem and 11 replied they had no modem.

Of the 303 departments that responded, 142 receive data via modem, 139 do not receive data via modem, 12 believed there was no need to receive data via modem, and 10 replied they did not have a modem.

Table 8. MODEMS USED TO TRANSMIT AND/OR RECEIVE DATA

	Transmit Data Via Modem		Receive Data Via Modem	
	# of Departments	Percent of Total	# of Departments	Percent of Total
Yes	173	56.5%	142	46.9%
No	113	36.9%	139	45.9%
No Modem	11	3.6%	10	3.3%
Not Needed	9	2.9%	12	4%
Total	306	100%	303	100%
Missing Cases	13		16	

Printers

A printer is a device that produces a paper document. Printer types are differentiated by how the printer creates the printout. Police departments indicated the number of printers (by type) they use. Eighty percent of police departments (258 agencies) reported they have at least one black and white laser printer, and 62% of responding departments reported having at least one color ink jet printer (198 agencies). Table 9 shows the type and number of printers departments use.

Table 9. PRINTERS

Printers	# of Departments	Minimum	Maximum	Total
Black & White Laser	258	1	290	1,178
Dot-Matrix	226	1	51	940
Color Ink Jet	198	1	50	544
Color Laser	53	1	15	114
Black & White Ink Jet	52	1	7	117
Color Bubble Jet	44	1	8	99
Black & White Bubble Jet	12	1	4	20
Plotter	5	1	2	8
Other	7	1	4	12

Scanners

Scanners are similar to photocopiers in that they duplicate a hard copy image; however scanners translate the copied image into digital data rather than another hard copy (Webster's 1998). Scanners used in police departments often have the capability to scan fingerprints as well as documents.

Departments indicated the number of flatbed and hand-held scanners currently in use with fingerprint and document scanning capabilities. The number of departments that reported having a flatbed scanner was much higher in 1998 as compared to 1997 (168 departments in 1998 vs. 111 departments in 1997). As shown in Table 10, 52.6% of responding departments (168 departments) reported having at least one flatbed scanner, for a total of 283 throughout the Commonwealth. Of those departments that responded, 78 (30.6%) are able to scan fingerprint cards.

Table 10. SCANNERS

Scanner	# of Departments	Minimum	Maximum	Total
Flatbed Scanners	168	1	30	283
Hand-Held Scanners	5	1	1	5

COMMUNICATION EQUIPMENT

Police Radios

Police radios ensure constant communication between officers in the field and personnel stationed at headquarters. Portable radios are hand-held devices that an officer carries and/or attaches to his/her person, while mobile radios are physically located in a police vehicle. Repeaters "receive frequencies and re-transmit the same signal on a different frequency. The main purpose of repeaters is to provide a wide area of coverage to stations operating in VHF, UHF, etc. They are useful when operating with hand-held, low power radios or transmitting from a car" by boosting the signal so it can reach farther (Coletti, 1999). Base Stations are larger, more powerful radios usually located at headquarters and used for dispatch.

Nearly all responding police agencies reported having hand-held radios (96.5%), mobile radios (93.4%), and base stations (92.7%). Sixty-five percent of departments reported using repeaters. Table 11 indicates the number of departments who have radio equipment, the minimum and maximum number of equipment, and the total of each type of equipment.

Table 11. POLICE RADIOS

Police Radios	# of Departments	Minimum	Maximum	Total
Portable (Hand-Held)	308	1	2,800	13,952
Mobile (Vehicle)	298	1	175	3,513
Base Stations	296	1	38	507
Repeaters	208	1	115	585
Other	15	1	6	38

Fax Machines

A fax machine "is a device that sends or receives pictures and text over a telephone line" (Internet.com Corporation, 1999). Two hundred and eighty-five (285) departments responded they had a fax machine, with a minimum of 1 machine and a maximum of 100 fax machines in a department. There are a total of 572 fax machines used by responding police agencies in Massachusetts.

DISPATCH

Global Positioning System (GPS) Receivers

A Global Positioning System (GPS) is a system that uses satellites to pinpoint locations on the earth's surface. By accepting the signals the satellite sends, a receiver can, with great precision, locate an object's longitude and latitude (United States Navy Observatory, 1999). Portable GPS receivers are hand-held and Mobile GPS receivers are mounted in vehicles. Both use GPS to track or locate a vehicle. An Automated Vehicle Locator (AVL) is used by dispatch to track police vehicles for more efficient dispatching (United States Navy Observatory, 1999).

As shown in Table 12, police departments indicated the number of GPS receivers and/or Automatic Vehicle Locator (AVL) systems they currently use.

Table 12. GPS RECEIVERS

GPS Receivers	Department	Minimum	Maximum	Total
Portable (hand-held) GPS Receivers	16	1	3	21
AVL Systems	6	1	35	85
Mobile (Vehicle) GPS Receivers	6	1	30	50

Dispatch Capabilities

Local Police departments reported their dispatching capability in five categories: Computer Aided Dispatch (CAD), manual dispatch, CAD provided by another jurisdiction, manual dispatch by another jurisdiction, and none of the above. Computer Aided Dispatch (CAD) is an automated public safety system that processes dispatching tasks usually performed by the dispatcher (Buena Park, CA Police Department, 1999). CAD may be a simple display of pertinent information on a screen, to the actual selection and notification of field units by the computer. 9-1-1 systems may be interfaced with CAD systems. Departments that utilize manual dispatch do not have an automated system. As Table 13 indicates, the majority of responding police agencies (71%) reported utilizing CAD. Only 12 percent of agencies perform manual dispatch.

Table 13. DISPATCH CAPABILITIES

Dispatch Capabilities	Frequency	Percent of Total
Computer Aided Dispatch (CAD)	223	70.6%
Manual Dispatch	38	12%
Manual Dispatch Provided by Another Jurisdiction	29	9.2%
CAD Provided by Another Jurisdiction	23	7.3%
None of the Above	3	.9%
Total	316	100%
Missing	3	

Dispatch Jurisdiction

Police departments are often responsible for dispatching a number of services. Of the local police departments that responded: 272 departments (85.3%) dispatch for police; 175 (54.9%) dispatch for fire services; and 182 (57.1%) dispatch for EMS. Thirty-nine (39) police departments (13.4%) serve as a public safety answering point for another police department.

PHOTOGRAPHIC EQUIPMENT

Photographic equipment is used for various functions, such as documenting crimes and crime scenes, domestic violence incidents, and mug shots.

Police departments reported what method(s) they used when taking mug shots. The two most frequently reported photographic equipment used were instant film (e.g., Polaroid™) and digitized, which allows the electronic transfer of photographs. A total of 233 departments (73%) reported using instant film for mug shots while 127 agencies (40%) used digitized mug shots (Table 14). The 1998 survey revealed a decline in the number of departments utilizing instant film, from 246 departments in 1997 to 233 in 1998. Interestingly, the survey found a large increase in the number of departments utilizing digitized photographic equipment, from 85 departments in 1997 to 127 in 1998.

Table 14. PHOTOGRAPHIC EQUIPMENT USED FOR MUG SHOTS

Photographic Equipment Used for Mug Shots	# of Departments	Percent of Total
Instant Film (Polaroid™)	233	73%
Digitized	127	39.8%
Rolled Film (negatives/prints)	71	22.3%
Video Recorder	37	11.6%
Mug Shots taken at County Lockup	14	4.4%
Other	7	2.2%
Not Applicable	6	1.9%

Police departments also indicated other purposes for which they use photographic equipment. As shown in Table 15, ninety-two percent (92.5%) of departments (295) use photographic equipment to record evidence at crime scenes, while 90% of departments (287) use such equipment at motor vehicle accidents. Photographic equipment is also used for purposes such as sex offender registry (238 agencies), firearms licenses (227 agencies), and child identification programs (160 agencies).

Table 15. OTHER PHOTOGRAPHIC EQUIPMENT USES

Photographic Equipment Uses	# of Departments	Percent of Total
Crime Scene Evidence	295	92.5%
Motor Vehicle Accidents	287	90%
Sex Offender Registry	238	74.6%
Firearms Licenses	227	71.2%
Child ID Program	160	50.2%
Other	27	8.5%

Furthermore, two hundred and eighty-four (284) police departments (93.1%) reported using photographic equipment to record physical evidence from domestic violence incidents. Of those departments that used photographic equipment in domestic violence cases, 237 departments

(83.5%) use instant film (Polaroid); 105 departments (37%) use rolled film (negative/prints); 86 departments (30.3%) use digitized equipment; and 8 departments (2.8%) use other photographic equipment, most often a video recorder.

MOBILE EQUIPMENT

Cruisers

Police departments indicated the number of marked and unmarked cruisers and also, the number of marked and unmarked cruisers with mobile computing devices. As Tables 16 and 17 demonstrate, 312 departments reported having a total of 2,836 marked cruisers, and 260 departments reported having a total of 1,566 unmarked cruisers.

Table 16. MARKED CRUISERS

Marked Cruisers	Department	Minimum	Maximum	Total
Total Number of Marked Cruisers	312	1	385	2,836
Marked Cruisers with neither MDTs nor Laptops	176	1	40	923
Marked Cruisers with Laptop Computers	102	1	48	702
Marked Cruisers with MDTs	87	1	270	700
Marked Cruiser with both MDTs and Laptops	16	1	9	72

Table 17. UNMARKED CRUISERS

Unmarked Cruisers	Department	Minimum	Maximum	Total
Total Number of Unmarked Cruisers	260	1	295	1,566
Unmarked Cruisers with neither MDTs nor Laptops	146	1	35	609
Unmarked Cruisers with Laptop Computers	37	1	11	76
Unmarked Cruisers with MDTs	21	1	30	64
Unmarked Cruiser with both MDTs and Laptops	6	1	2	7

Mobile Data Terminals (MDTs)

Historically, requests for information regarding individuals, license plates, vehicles, etc. were required to be placed through a dispatch center, requiring a desk officer to manually look up the information or call another agency for the information. This is a relatively time consuming process resulting in officers losing valuable time attempting to retrieve information.

Mobile Data Terminals provide easier access to remote information. From an officer's vehicle, instant access to nationwide databases of wanted persons and to driver license, stolen vehicle, and wanted property information is available. This data is delivered directly to the computer screen in the officer's vehicle, without the need for dispatcher assistance or use of the radio. Also, when an officer is dispatched to an address, the computer automatically displays information regarding previous calls at the location, warrant information, and potential hazards. Additionally, pertinent data such as case numbers, times, and other information needed by officers to complete paperwork in the field (e.g., accident reports, lost/stolen property reports, etc.) can now be transmitted via MDTs. Finally, MDTs significantly reduce voice radio congestion by eliminating the officer's need to call in for initial information (Buena Park, CA Police Department, 1999).

Ninety-five (95) departments responded they had a MDT (non-MDT laptop computers are not included in this calculation), with a minimum of 1 MDT in a department and a maximum of 320 MDTs in a department. There are a total of 886 MDTs reportedly in operation by local police agencies across the Commonwealth. When asked if there were plans to add any MDTs in the coming year, 53 departments reported they plan on purchasing additional MDTs. Fifty-one of these departments reported they will add a total of 268 MDTs this year. Police departments were also asked to indicate the vendor they use for their MDTs. Sixty-six (66) departments reportedly use Cerulean (Packet Cluster), 15 use Pamet, 8 use MicroSystems, 2 use SCA, 1 uses Harmon Technologies, and 1 uses DM Data Corporation.

Fifty-six (56) departments' mobile data terminals use Radio Frequency (RF) to communicate with their in-house computer system, while 49 departments use Cellular Digital Packet Data (CDPD). Of those who are not using CDPD, 23 plan to switch to CDPD, 38 departments have no plans of switching, and 39 are not sure.

RECORDS

Records Management Systems (RMS)

Records Management Systems (RMS) allow for easy access to various information collected by police departments including: on-line bookkeeping, incident report generation, Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) data submission, restraining order notifications, arrests and booking, citations, and calls for service. Many computer software companies provide departments with RMS.

The Automation Survey obtained information from local police departments as to which vendor(s) currently provide(s) their Records Management System. Table 18 provides a summary of department responses. Approximately one-third of responding police departments indicated that Information Management Corporation provides their Records Management System.

Table 18. RECORDS MANAGEMENT SYSTEM (RMS) VENDORS

RMS Vendors	# of Departments	Percent of Total
Information Management Corp. (IMC)	103	32.3%
Pamet	67	21%
Cerulean (Packet Cluster)	57	17.9%
Micro Systems	47	14.7%
Queues Enforth Development (QED)	17	5.3%
HTE Chiefs	5	1.6%
UNISYS	5	1.6%
Business Records Corporation (BRC)	4	1.3%
DM Data Corporation	4	1.3%
Larimore	4	1.3%
Other	35	11%
Do Not Have an RMS System	31	9.7%

REPORTING

Computerized Police Reporting

Forms are accessible through a number of computer types including mainframes, mini-computers, laptops, and stand-alone computers, as well as any personal computers connected to a network. With the increase in computerized reporting and record keeping, some departments now have the capability to enter police reports in the field using laptops. Two hundred and eighty-five (285) police departments indicated they have the capability of completing computerized police report forms. Of those 285 police departments, 243 have form software integrated as a part of their Records Management System.

Table 19 describes the equipment police departments use to access form software.

Table 19. COMPUTERS WITH ACCESS TO FORM SOFTWARE

Computer Type	Number of Departments	Percent of Total
PC Connected to a Network	161	50.4%
Mainframe Computer	71	22.2%
Laptop Computer	49	15.3%
Stand Alone Computer	45	14.1%
Mini-Computer	38	11.9%
Other	10	3.1%

Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR)

The Uniform Crime Reporting program, operated by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, collects summary crime data on both arrests and reported crime. Police departments across the Commonwealth submit data on a voluntary basis to the Massachusetts State Police Crime Reporting Unit (CRU). Of those police departments that responded to the survey, 188 departments indicated they currently report Uniform Crime Reports, 79 reported they do not submit UCR data, and 52 departments did not respond to the question. It is important to note that, according to the CRU, 262 local departments actually report UCR data (127 of these departments submit NIBRS data).

UCR Submission Process

The frequency of UCR data submission varies by department. The majority of police agencies provide UCR data to the CRU on a monthly basis. However, crime data is also submitted on a quarterly and annual basis. Of the 188 departments that reported submitting UCR data, 153 indicated what best described their UCR submission process. Table 20 specifies the frequency in which individual departments submit UCR data.

Table 20. UCR SUBMISSION PROCESS

UCR Submission Process	Frequency	Percent
Monthly Data Submitted the Following Month	100	65.4%
Monthly Data Submitted Within 6 Months	17	11.1%
3 Months of Data Submitted Quarterly	11	7.2%
12 Months of Data Submitted at End of the Year	6	3.9%
Data Submitted at Various Time Intervals	16	10.5%
None of the Above	3	2%
Total	153	100%
Missing	35	

Intention to Submit UCR Data

Those departments who indicated they do not submit UCR data were asked if, and at what time, they planned to report crime data to the State Police. Approximately 40% anticipate submitting reports within the next year, whereas the remaining percentage indicated their participation in the program to be beyond a year, or that they have no plans to report (Table 21). The following is a summary of when departments intend on submitting data to the CRU.

Table 21. TIME FRAME FOR SUBMITTING UCR DATA

Intent to Submit UCR Data	Frequency	Percent
Within 6 Months	9	28.1%
Within a Year	7	21.9%
More Than a Year	7	21.9%
No Current Plans to Submit	5	15.6%
None of the Above	4	12.5%
Total	32	100%
Missing	47	

There are a variety of dilemmas departments face when preparing to report data, including computer limitations, a limited number of available personnel, lack of training, and management decisions. Of the 79 departments who reported not submitting UCR data, only a few departments provided the following reasons why they do not currently participate in the UCR program.

Table 22. REASONS FOR NOT SUBMITTING UCR DATA

No Currents Plans to Submit UCR Data	Frequency	Percent
Computer Limitations	6	7.6%
Need Training	5	6.3%
Personnel Shortage	4	5.1%
Management Decision	1	1.3%

National Incident Based Reporting System (NIBRS)

The National Incident Based Reporting System is an automated, non-summary incident based method of reporting crime statistics. NIBRS was developed in response to an increasing need for more detailed and accurate crime data, which is not available through the Uniform Crime Reports. Unlike that of the UCR, NIBRS data reflects single incidents and arrests based on 22 offense categories and 46 specific crimes. NIBRS is anticipated to become the primary source of crime data in the coming years, taking the place of the Uniform Crime Reports. To date, participation both statewide and nationally reflect only a partial total of law enforcement agencies. According to the Crime Reporting Unit, 136 police departments submit NIBRS data. The Automation Survey requested information from police departments pertaining to both their current NIBRS reporting status and submission processes.

NIBRS Data Submission Process

Of those police departments that responded to the survey, 136 departments indicated they currently report NIBRS, 180 reported they do not, and 3 departments did not answer the question. Of the 136 respondents, 131 reported what best described their NIBRS submission process. NIBRS reports are submitted via e-mail, computer disk, or through the CRU's Bulletin Board. As Table 23 indicates, of those reporting agencies, over one third submit data by way of the Bulletin Board, followed by e-mail. The table below lists the frequency of departmental responses.

Table 23. NIBRS DATA SUBMISSION PROCESS

NIBRS Data Submission Process	Frequency	Percent
CRU Bulletin Board	49	37.4%
E-Mail	39	29.8%
Computer Disk	29	22.1%
None of the Above	14	10.7%
Total	131	100%
Missing	5	

Intention to Submit NIBRS Data

Like the UCR, the submission of crime data is not always feasible for police agencies. For the 180 departments who are not taking part in the NIBRS program, 152 indicated at what time they plan on doing so (Table 24).

Table 24. TIME FRAME FOR SUBMITTING NIBRS DATA

Intent to Submit NIBRS Data	Frequency	Percent
More Than a Year	53	34.9%
Within a Year	42	27.6%
No Current Plans to Submit	26	17.1%
Within 6 Months	23	15.1%
None of the Above	8	5.3%
Total	152	100%
Missing	28	

The police departments who indicated they currently did not submit NIBRS data were given the opportunity to provide reasons for not doing so. Those reasons are listed in the Table 25.

Table 25. REASONS FOR NOT SUBMITTING NIBRS DATA

No Current Plans to Submit NIBRS Data	Frequency	Percent
Need Training	42	23.3%
Personnel Shortage	34	18.9%
Computer Limitations	34	18.9%
Funding Limitations	24	13.3%
Management Decision	14	7.8%
Problems Meeting NIBRS Standards	8	4.4%
Other	4	2.2%

Hate Crime Reporting

Following the passing of Massachusetts General Law Chapter 22C, §33, police departments are encouraged to submit hate crime reports to the Crime Reporting Unit of the State Police. Though hate crime reporting is not mandated by state law, the 1998 Automation Survey found that 290 police departments (92.7%) who responded to this question do in fact submit reports to the CRU, compared to a mere 23 departments (7.3%) who currently do not report hate crimes.

Hate crime reports can be submitted to the State Police via hard copy (disk) or through NIBRS (hate crime incidents are collected by NIBRS). When given a choice for what method is used for submitting hate crime reports, 62% reported submitting reports by hard copy and 38% by means of NIBRS data submission.

Intention to Submit Hate Crime Reports

Of the 23 police departments who reported they do not currently submit hate crime data, 21 departments indicated their plans to report hate crime incidents in the future. The following is a breakdown of this group of respondents.

Table 26. TIME FRAME FOR SUBMITTING HATE CRIME REPORTS

Intent to Submit Hate Crime Reports	Frequency	Percent
More Than a Year	6	28.6%
Within a Year	5	23.8%
No Current Plans to Submit	5	23.8%
Within 6 Months	4	19%
None of the Above	1	4.8%
Total	21	100%
Missing	2	

Lastly, departments who do not submit hate crime reports and have no plans to do so in the future were asked to identify those reasons for which they will not submit reports. Table 27 presents those reasons.

Table 27. REASONS FOR NOT SUBMITTING HATE CRIME REPORTS

No Current Plans to Begin Hate Crime Reporting	Frequency	Percent
There are No Hate Crimes to Report	8	34.8%
Personnel Shortage	4	17.4%
Computer Limitations	3	13%

Juvenile Lockup Data Reporting

According to Federal regulations, alleged juvenile delinquents may be held securely in a police lockup for up to six hours for processing purposes only. Status offenders (e.g., runaways, truants, etc.) may not be detained in secure police lockup for any amount of time. There are approximately 196 local police departments with at least one cell that has been approved by the Department of Youth Services (DYS). Of all automation survey respondents, 171 departments indicated they have at least one DYS-approved juvenile lockup, 126 departments reported they do not have a DYS approved lockup, and 22 departments did not respond to the question.

Police departments that have one or more DYS-approved juvenile lockup cells are required to report data on a monthly basis. The Criminal History Systems Board has made it possible for police departments to submit data through the Criminal Justice Information System (CJIS). For those that do not have access to CJIS, paper forms are the primary means of data submission. Table 28 provides a summary of responses regarding approved juvenile cell data submission.

Table 28. METHOD OF SUBMITTING JUVENILE LOCKUP DATA

Submit Juvenile Lockup Data Via	Frequency	Percent
CJIS	135	81.3%
Paper Forms	30	18.1%
Do Not Submit the Data	1	.6%
Total	166	100%
Missing	5	

Currently, 31 police departments do not submit juvenile lockup data through CJIS. Twenty-one (21) departments provided the following reasons:

Table 29. REASONS FOR NOT SUBMITTING JUVENILE LOCKUP DATA VIA CJIS

Do Not Submit Juvenile Lockup Data via CJIS	Frequency	Percent
Did Not Know It Was Possible	12	57.1%
Do Not Know How	3	14.3%
Would Rather Submit Paper Forms	4	19%
Do Not Have Access to CJIS Terminal	2	9.5%
Total	21	100%
Missing	10	

Operating Under the Influence Reporting (OUI)

Massachusetts police departments are required to submit OUI incident reports to the Registry of Motor Vehicles. The Criminal History Systems Board has computerized the report submission process and has made it available via CJIS. Respondents were asked to indicate the method by which OUI reports are entered. These responses are summarized in Table 30.

Table 30. METHOD OF SUBMITTING OUI DATA

Submit OUI Reports Via	Frequency	Percent
CJIS	275	88.1%
Paper Forms	29	9.3%
Do Not Submit the Data	4	1.3%
None of the Above	4	1.3%
Total	312	100%
Missing	7	

Currently, 37 police departments reported they do not submit OUI reports through the CJIS network. The following reasons were provided by 30 of the 37 departments:

Table 31. REASONS FOR NOT SUBMITTING OUI DATA VIA CJIS

Do Not Submit OUI Reports via CJIS	Frequency	Percent
None of the Reasons Specified	17	56.7%
Do not Have Access to CJIS Terminal	5	16.7%
Would Rather Submit Paper Forms	4	13.3%
Do not Know How	2	6.7%
Did not Know it was Possible	1	3.3%
Other	1	3.3%
Total	30	100%
Missing	7	

Domestic Violence Reporting System (DVRS)

The Domestic Violence Reporting System is an automated, centralized reporting system that will offer both police departments and District Attorney's Offices the capabilities of performing online entries and queries of domestic violence incidents. The DVRS is currently a pilot program with 20 police departments currently participating. Respondents were asked if they plan on participating in the program, and if not, were provided an option within the survey to indicate if they were interested in obtaining more information. Table 32 provides a summary of those responses. The high number (275) of departments that do not know about the program or would like more information can be attributed to the program being in its pilot phase.

Table 32. FUTURE DVRS PARTICIPATION

DVRS Participation Planned	Frequency	Percent
Yes	89	27.9%
No	16	5.0%
Do not Know About the Program	104	32.6%
Would Like More Information	171	53.6%

FINGERPRINTING

Fingerprinting Techniques

Police departments vary in the methods of fingerprinting persons. Fingerprinting methods besides ink printing have been introduced and are slowly being utilized by police agencies across the state. These new methods include computerized and inkless fingerprinting. Inkless fingerprinting consists of a clear chemical and special paper to document an individual's prints. The process allows for a cleaner and clearer print. Computerized printing, or Live-scan, provides police departments the ability to scan fingerprints electronically.

According to the results of the current survey, the most common method reported is ink fingerprinting. In addition, 37 departments (11.6%) are using inkless methods. Table 33 indicates the method(s) used by responding police departments when fingerprinting a person.

Table 33. FINGERPRINTING METHODS

Fingerprinting Methods	# of Departments	Percent of Total
Ink	278	87.1%
Inkless	36	11.3%
Other	3	.9%

Live-Scan

Live-Scan is an automated fingerprinting system in which a subject's fingers are rolled onto scanning pads which effectively captures his/her fingerprints, without the use of ink (Manhattan Beach, CA Police Department, 1999). Live-Scan prevents many of the problems related to ink printing, such as smudging, smearing, and over and under inking. An operator can preview each print as it is being rolled and can reject and re-roll any unacceptable prints. With a Live-Scan unit, a person is printed once and cards may then be printed in the quantities necessary.

Fourteen (14) police departments reported utilizing live-scan technology for fingerprinting, an increase from the four departments utilizing live scan technology in 1997. Police departments were asked to report the number of AFIS-compatible live-scan devices their departments use. Eleven (11) departments reporting having a total of 23 Live-Scan devices. Ten (10) of those departments, reported having a FBI-certified Live-Scan device.

Submission of Fingerprints

Although efforts are underway to designate the State Police as a single source submitter of fingerprint submissions to the FBI (as a prerequisite to Massachusetts in becoming III compliant[1]), individual departments often submit fingerprint cards to both agencies.

[1] The Interstate Identification Index (III) is an FBI system for conducting interstate criminal records checks. Massachusetts anticipates III compliance during the latter part of federal fiscal year 2000.

As Table 34 depicts, in the 1998 Automation Survey, the majority of police departments (89.3%) indicated they submitted cards to (at least) the State Police, and 160 departments (50.2%) submit cards to (at least) FBI. One hundred fifty one (151) departments submit cards to both the FBI and the State Police. The Automation Survey also indicated that departments are submitting fingerprint records to a sheriff's department, thereby promoting a greater degree of information sharing. In addition, a very small number of police agencies in the state (4.1%) reported that they do not submit fingerprint records, or that they report to other agencies.

Table 34. SUBMISSION OF FINGERPRINTS

Submission of Fingerprints	Frequency	Percent of Total
State Police	285	89.3%
FBI	160	50.2%
County Sheriff	27	8.5%
Do not Submit Fingerprint Cards	13	4.1%
Other	9	2.8%

Submission of Fingerprints for Misdemeanor Arrests

Survey results indicate that 176 of the 308 responding police departments submit fingerprints for misdemeanor arrests, in addition to felony arrests. Of those 176 departments, 168 departments described the time frame in which they submit their misdemeanor fingerprint cards (Table 35).

Table 35. SUBMISSION OF FINGERPRINTS FOR MISDEMEANOR ARRESTS

Submission of Fingerprints for Misdemeanor Arrests	Frequency	Percent
Submit Cards More than Half the Time	141	83.9%
Submit Cards Less than Half the Time	26	15.5%
None of the Above	1	.6%
Total	168	100%
Missing	9	

OFFENSE TRACKING

Offense Based Tracking Numbers (OBTN)

Offense Based Tracking Numbers (OBTN) are assigned at the time of arrest (associated with an arrestee's fingerprints) and are used to track an offender through the criminal justice system. OBTN's are identification codes applied to each arrest, which will allow the matching of arrest data to disposition data supplied by the Office of the Commissioner of Probation. OBTN's can be entered into the department's central system electronically, then attached to fingerprint cards. OBTN barcodes, though not currently being utilized by all departments, provide a more efficient means to both enter and retrieve offender information. Rather than a 13-digit alphanumeric number, barcodes can be scanned and information becomes available immediately, providing law enforcement personnel within both policing and corrections to enter and retrieve offender information during any time between arrest and incarceration.

Table 36 presents OBTN information provided by responding police departments. In the 1998 survey, 194 departments reported they have implemented an OBTN system, an increase from the 181 departments reporting OBTN use in 1997. Of the 194 departments who have implemented OBTN, 169 reported implementing OBTN electronically, 158 attach OBTN to fingerprint cards, and 10 utilize barcodes for OBTN.

Table 36. OFFENSE BASED TRACKING NUMBERS

OBTN	OBTN Participation		Electronic Implementation		OBTN Attached to Fingerprint Cards		OBTN Barcodes	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Yes	194	67.4%	169	89.4%	158	87.8%	10	5.7%
No	94	32.6%	20	10.6%	22	12.2%	164	94.3%
Total	288	100%	189	100%	180	100%	174	100%
Missing	31		5		14		20	

CRIME ANALYSIS

Crime Analysis Capabilities

Police agencies continue to expand in-house crime analysis capabilities within the department, as opposed to relying on outside agencies. Departments are beginning to utilize computer programs which have the ability to geographically map crimes within their town and/or county. These mapping programs have shown to be advantageous in determining community "hot-spots," thereby assisting in the development of proactive law enforcement responses to crime.

Survey results indicated another common method of crime analysis, specifically the use of programs that allow for the generation of crime statistics. The availability of crime analysis methods within the department provides on-site crime data and information to assist law enforcement personnel.

Although the majority of local law enforcement agencies (72.4%) have computer capability to generate crime statistics, only 18 percent of departments (56 agencies) reported having GIS (Table 37).

Table 37. CRIME ANALYSIS CAPABILITIES

In-House Crime Analysis Capabilities	# of Departments	Percent of Total
Computer Programs to Generate Crime Statistics	232	72.7%
Computer Geographic Information Systems (GIS) to Locate Crime Hot Spots	56	17.6%
Other	11	3.4%

Crime Analysts

To further assess the level of available crime analysis methods within police departments, the Automation Survey obtained information on the number of departments with full-time and/or trained crime analysts. As Table 38 shows, 24 police departments (13.8%) reported having a full-time crime analyst, and 37 departments (21.9%) reported having an individual trained in crime analysis.

Table 38. CRIME ANALYST PERSONNEL

Crime Analysts	Full-Time Crime Analysts		Trained Crime Analysts	
	# of Departments	Percent of Total	# of Departments	Percent of Total
Yes	24	13.8%	37	21.9%
No	150	86.2%	132	78.1%
Total	174	100%	169	100%
Missing	145		150	

REFERENCES

AFC Computer Services (1999). Retrieved March 15, 1999 from the World Wide Web: http://www.E4free.com.html

Buena Park, CA Police Department (1999). Retrieved March 15, 1999 from the World Wide Web: http://www.bppd.com

Coletti, Vinicio (1999). *The Ham Dictionary of Terms by IKOWRB*. Retrieved March 15, 1999 from the World Wide Web: http://www.webcom.com/vcoletti/radio.shtml

Internet.com Corporation (1999). Retrieved September 28,1999 from the World Wide Web: http://www.internet.com

Manhattan Beach, CA Police Department (1999). Retrieved March 15, 1999 from the World Wide Web: http://www.ci.manhattan-beach.ca.us/police/cal_id.html.

Sun Microsystems (1999). Retrieved March 15, 1999 from the World Wide Web: http://www.sun.com.html

United States Navy Observatory (1999). Retrieved March 15, 1999 from the World Wide Web: http://tychno.usno.navy.mil

Webster's Pocket Computer Dictionary of the English Language, Trident Press International, Radcliffe, 1998.

APPENDIX

POLICE DEPARTMENTS THAT RESPONDED TO THE 1998 POLICE AUTOMATION SURVEY

1 Abington Police Department
2 Acton Police Department
3 Acushnet Police Department
4 Adams Police Department
5 Agawam Police Department
6 Amesbury Police Department
7 Amherst Police Department
8 Andover Police Department
9 Aquinnah Police Department
10 Arlington Police Department
11 Ashburnham Police Department
12 Ashby Police Department
13 Ashfield Police Department
14 Ashland Police Department
15 Athol Police Department
16 Attleboro Police Department
17 Auburn Police Department
18 Ayer Police Department
19 Barnstable Police Department
20 Barre Police Department
21 Becket Police Department
22 Bedford Police Department
23 Belchertown Police Department
24 Bellingham Police Department
25 Belmont Police Department
26 Berkley Police Department
27 Berlin Police Department
28 Bernardston Police Department
29 Beverly Police Department
30 Billerica Police Department
31 Blackstone Police Department
32 Bolton Police Department
33 Boston Police Department
34 Bourne Police Department
35 Boxborough Police Department
36 Boxford Police Department
37 Boylston Police Department
38 Braintree Police Department
39 Brewster Police Department
40 Bridgewater Police Department
41 Brimfield Police Department
42 Brockton Police Department
43 Brookline Police Department
44 Buckland Police Department
45 Burlington Police Department
46 Cambridge Police Department
47 Canton Police Department
48 Carlisle Police Department
49 Carver Police Department
50 Charlemont Police Department
51 Charlton Police Department
52 Chatham Police Department
53 Chelmsford Police Department
54 Chelsea Police Department
55 Cheshire Police Department
56 Chester Police Department
57 Chesterfield Police Department
58 Chicopee Police Department
59 Chilmark Police Department
60 Clarksburg Police Department
61 Clinton Police Department
62 Cohasset Police Department
63 Colrain Police Department
64 Concord Police Department
65 Conway Police Department
66 Cummington Police Department
67 Dalton Police Department
68 Danvers Police Department
69 Dartmouth Police Department
70 Dedham Police Department
71 Deerfield Police Department
72 Dennis Police Department
73 Dighton Police Department
74 Douglas Police Department
75 Dover Police Department
76 Dracut Police Department
77 Dudley Police Department
78 Dunstable Police Department
79 Duxbury Police Department
80 East Bridgewater Police Department
81 East Brookfield Police Department
82 East Longmeadow Police Department

83 Eastham Police Department
84 Easthampton Police Department
85 Easton Police Department
86 Edgartown Police Department
87 Egremont Police Department
88 Erving Police Department
89 Essex Police Department
90 Everett Police Department
91 Fairhaven Police Department
92 Falmouth Police Department
93 Fitchburg Police Department
94 Foxborough Police Department
95 Framingham Police Department
96 Franklin Police Department
97 Freetown Police Department
98 Gardner Police Department
99 Georgetown Police Department
100 Gill Police Department
101 Gloucester Police Department
102 Goshen Police Department
103 Gosnold Police Department
104 Grafton Police Department
105 Granby Police Department
106 Granville Police Department
107 Great Barrinton Police Department
108 Greenfield Police Department
109 Groton Police Department
110 Groveland Police Department
111 Hadley Police Department
112 Halifax Police Department
113 Hamilton Police Department
114 Hampden Police Department
115 Hanover Police Department
116 Hanson Police Department
117 Hardwick Police Department
118 Harvard Police Department
119 Harwich Police Department
120 Hatfield Police Department
121 Haverhill Police Department
122 Hingham Police Department
123 Hinsdale Police Department
124 Holbrook Police Department
125 Holden Police Department
126 Holland Police Department
127 Holliston Police Department
128 Holyoke Police Department
129 Hopedale Police Department
130 Hopkinton Police Department
131 Hubbardston Police Department
132 Hudson Police Department
133 Hull Police Department
134 Huntington Police Department
135 Ipswich Police Department
136 Kingston Police Department
137 Lakeville Police Department
138 Lancaster Police Department
139 Lanesboro Police Department
140 Lawrence Police Department
141 Lee Police Department
142 Leicester Police Department
143 Lenox Police Department
144 Leominster Police Department
145 Leverett Police Department
146 Lexington Police Department
147 Leyden Police Department
148 Lincoln Police Department
149 Littleton Police Department
150 Longmeadow Police Department
151 Lowell Police Department
152 Ludlow Police Department
153 Lunenburg Police Department
154 Lynn Police Department
155 Malden Police Department
156 Manchester-by-the-Sea Police Department
157 Mansfield Police Department
158 Marblehead Police Department
159 Marion Police Department
160 Marlborough Police Department
161 Marshfield Police Department
162 Mashpee Police Department
163 Mattapoisett Police Department
164 Maynard Police Department
165 Medfield Police Department
166 Medford Police Department
167 Medway Police Department
168 Melrose Police Department
169 Merrimac Police Department
170 Methuen Police Department
171 Middleboro Police Department
172 Middlefield Police Department
173 Middleton Police Department
174 Millbury Police Department

175 Millville Police Department
176 Milton Police Department
177 Monson Police Department
178 Montague Police Department
179 Monterey Police Department
180 Nahant Police Department
181 Nantucket Police Department
182 Natick Police Department
183 Needham Police Departmert
184 New Braintree Police Department
185 New Marlborough Police Department
186 New Salem Police Department
187 Newbury Police Department
188 Newburyport Police Department
189 Newton Police Department
190 Norfolk Police Department
191 North Adams Police Department
192 North Andover Police Department
193 North Attleboro Police Department
194 North Brookfield Police Department
195 North Reading Police Department
196 Northampton Police Department
197 Northboro Police Department
198 Northbridge Police Department
199 Northfield Police Department
200 Norton Police Department
201 Norwell Police Department
202 Norwood Police Department
203 Oak Bluffs Police Department
204 Orange Police Department
205 Orleans Police Department
206 Oxford Police Department
207 Palmer Police Department
208 Paxton Police Department
209 Peabody Police Department
210 Pembroke Police Department
211 Pepperell Police Department
212 Peru Police Department
213 Petersham Police Department
214 Phillipston Police Department
215 Pittsfield Police Department
216 Plainville Police Department
217 Plymouth Police Department
218 Plympton Police Department
219 Princeton Police Department
220 Provincetown Police Department
221 Quincy Police Department
222 Randolph Police Department
223 Reading Police Department
224 Rehoboth Police Department
225 Revere Police Department
226 Rochester Police Department
227 Rockland Police Department
228 Rockport Police Department
229 Rowe Police Department
230 Rowley Police Dept
231 Royalston Police Department
232 Rutland Police Department
233 Salem Police Department
234 Salisbury Police Department
235 Sandisfield Police Department
236 Sandwich Police Department
237 Saugus Police Department
238 Scituate Police Department
239 Seekonk Police Department
240 Sharon Police Department
241 Sheffield Police Department
242 Shelburne Police Department
243 Sherborn Police Department
244 Shirley Police Department
245 Shrewsbury Police Department
246 Shutesbury Police Department
247 Somerset Police Department
248 Somerville Police Department
249 South Hadley Police Department
250 Southampton Police Department
251 Southborough Police Department
252 Southbridge Police Department
253 Southwick Police Department
254 Spencer Police Department
255 Springfield Police Department
256 Sterling Police Department
257 Stockbridge Police Department
258 Stoneham Police Department
259 Stoughton Police Department
260 Sturbridge Police Department
261 Sudbury Police Department
262 Sunderland Police Department
263 Sutton Police Department
264 Swampscott Police Department
265 Swansea Police Department
266 Templeton Police Department

267 Tewksbury Police Department
268 Tisbury Police Department
269 Topsfield Police Department
270 Townsend Police Department
271 Truro Police Department
272 Tyngsborough Police Department
273 Tyringham Police Department
274 Upton Police Department
275 Uxbridge Police Department
276 Wakefield Police Department
277 Wales Police Department
278 Walpole Police Department
279 Waltham Police Department
280 Ware Police Department
281 Wareham Police Department
282 Warren Police Department
283 Warwick Police Department
284 Watertown Police Department
285 Wayland Police Department
286 Webster Police Department
287 Wellesley Police Department
288 Wellfleet Police Department
289 Wendell Police Department
290 West Boylston Police Department
291 West Bridgewater Police Department
292 West Brookfield Police Department
293 West Newbury Police Department
294 West Springfield Police Department
295 West Stockbridge Police Department
296 West Tisbury Police Department
297 Westborough Police Department
298 Westfield Police Department
299 Westford Police Department
300 Westhampton Police Department
301 Westminster Police Department
302 Weston Police Department
303 Westport Police Department
304 Westwood Police Department
305 Weymouth Police Department
306 Whately Police Department
307 Whitman Police Department
308 Wilbraham Police Department
309 Williamsburg Police Department
310 Williamstown Police Department
311 Wilmington Police Dept
312 Winchendon Police Department
313 Winchester Police Department
314 Winthrop Police Department
315 Woburn Police Department
316 Worcester Police Department
317 Worthington Police Department
318 Wrentham Police Department
319 Yarmouth Police Department